

1 REMARKS

2 The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 and 20-
3 23 in view of the above amendments and the following arguments.
4

5 I. THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

6 Claim 1 is amended above to clarify the nature of the game play result and to more
7 specifically state what is concealed from the player during the bonus round and until they make
8 their selection in the bonus round. The step of obtaining the game play result now set out at
9 element (a) of claim 1 is supported, for example, at block 502 of Figure 5, and the text regarding
10 that process block particularly at page 19, lines 1-11. The association between a game play result
11 and a prize value is disclosed at page 16, lines 17-20 and page 22, lines 5-7, for example. As for
12 element (c) of claim 1 as amended above, the step of enabling the player to play the bonus round
13 and presenting the selection options is disclosed in connection with process blocks 506 and 507
14 of Figure 5 and the disclosure text at page 20, lines 1-9, and in connection with Figure 7 and the
15 related text at page 21, lines 10-19. Further alternatives regarding enabling the player to play the
16 bonus round are described in the original application from page 22, line 11 to page 24, line 15.
17 Also, the limitation in current element (c) of claim 1 of “after the game play request” is apparent
18 from the process set out in Figure 5 and the original application at page 19, line 1 to page 20, line
19 9. Concealing the prize value until the player selection in the bonus round as required at element
20 (d) of amended claim 1 is disclosed, for example, in the original disclosure beginning at page 20,
21 line 10 in connection with Figures 7 and 8. Displaying the prize value as now required at

1 element (e) of claim 1 is disclosed in the present application, for example, at page 22, lines 4-11
2 in connection with Figure 8.

3 Claim 2 is amended above to clarify the process according to the invention when the
4 obtained game play result is not associated with a bonus round. This amendment is supported in
5 the original disclosure by Figure 5 and the disclosure text at page 19, lines 17-20 regarding
6 Figure 5, for example.

7 The remainder of the claims depending from claim 1 are amended as necessary for
8 consistency with claim 1 and to remove certain superfluous language.

9 Independent claims 9 and 18 are amended similarly to claim 1, and their respective
10 dependent claims are amended as necessary for consistency. Claim 19 is canceled in view of the
11 amendment to claim 18.

12 Because all of the amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure in the case,
13 the amendments do not introduce new matter.

14 It is noted that the amendment at element (b) of claim 9 to replace “identify” with
15 “obtained” is made simply for consistency with the other independent claims. This change is not
16 intended to change the scope of the claims. As indicated in the body of the application, it is
17 intended that the words “identify,” “obtain,” and “produce” are all equivalent for describing how
18 the game play result comes about.

19
20 II. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBJECTIONABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

21 The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as
22 based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The Applicants traverse this rejection.

1 In view of the discussion in the Final Office Action at the last ten lines of page 2 and the
2 first line of page 3, the Section 112 rejections appear to be based on a perceived inconsistency
3 between the play of a bingo game and the requirements of claim 1 in concealing the game play.
4 In particular, it is apparent that the Section 112 rejections are based upon the belief that it is not
5 possible to conceal a result in a bingo game. At the bottom of page 2 and continuing to the top of
6 page 3, the Final Office Action makes the following statement:

7 The examiner notes that in a bingo-type game, the status of the game (e.g. how many
8 places on the card are daubed) is constantly displayed to a player throughout the game up
9 to and including the end of the game.

10 While this was correct as to traditional bingo-hall style bingo games, it is not correct for at least
11 some modern high-speed bingo gaming systems. In particular, the bingo gaming system
12 disclosed in U.S. patent application serial No. 10/456,721, which is incorporated in the present
13 application by reference, discloses a bingo gaming system in which the player is not necessarily
14 displayed their bingo card and is not required to manually daub the various matched card
15 locations on a bingo card. The Examiner is referred to paragraphs 46, 49, and 56 of the
16 published version of the incorporated application, U.S. patent publication US2004/0152499A1,
17 and is also referred to the present application at page 19, lines 6-11. Because the player is not
18 necessarily shown their bingo card in the course of a bingo game conducted in this system and
19 because the player is not required to manually daub the various matched locations on the card,
20 the player does not necessarily know their result for the play until it is displayed to them through
21 some alternate display arrangement, such as a reel-type display.

22 Furthermore, the present application specifically illustrates in the example of Figure 7
23 how the bingo result and the prize associated with that result may be concealed from the player

1 during the bonus round according to the present invention. In particular, areas 708, 709, and 710
2 in Figure 7 are greyed out (or omitted altogether) prior to the player's selection according to the
3 present invention so as to hide information that would communicate the game play result to the
4 player. Figure 8 then shows these areas after the player's selection in the bonus round.

5 In view of the above comments the Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 112
6 rejection of claims 1-23, and respectfully submit that the rejection should be withdrawn. The
7 Applicants further submit that the interpretation of the claims as set out in the first four lines of
8 page 3 is in error. The concealment set out in the present claims refers to concealment of the
9 result obtained for a game play request in the base game and does not refer to concealment of an
10 aggregate outcome from play in the base game and bonus game.

11 The Applicants further note that although the Section 112 rejection appears to be based
12 on a perceived inconsistency between the requirements of claim 3 and the requirements of claim
13 1, the rejection is applied to all 23 claims. Even if there was a technical inconsistency between
14 the requirements of an independent claim and one of its dependent claims, a Section 112
15 rejection would only be appropriate as to the dependent claim and any claims depending from it.
16 The rejection would not be appropriate against the independent claim. Thus the stated basis for
17 the Section 112 rejection in this case applies only to claim 3 and not to all 23 claims in any event.
18

19 III. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY CITED ART

20 The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-20, and 22 under 35
21 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,461,241 to Webb et al. ("Webb" or "the
22 Webb patent"). The Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by Webb.

1 The Applicants note that all of the rejections appear to be based on a fundamentally
2 incorrect interpretation of the claims. In particular, the Final Office Action indicates that the
3 claimed concealing of a game play result is interpreted for purposes of the rejections as
4 “concealing the outcome of the aggregate game (the result produced by the combination of the
5 base and bonus games).” However, as discussed above in connection with the claim
6 amendments, the concealment required in the claims refers to concealment of a result
7 (specifically a prize value associated with the result) in a base game. The claims further require
8 that this concealed prize value from the result of the base game is later displayed in response to
9 the player’s selection in the bonus round so that the prize value appears as a result of play in the
10 bonus round. This concealment of the prize value from one game (as required at element (d) of
11 claim 1, and element (c) of claim 9) and then the display of the prize value in response to the
12 bonus round selection (as required at element (e) of claim 1, element (c) of claim 9, and element
13 (b) of claim 18) are not disclosed or in any way suggested by Webb. Therefore the Applicants
14 believe that claims 1, 9, and 18, and their respective dependent claims, are not anticipated by
15 Webb, and respectfully request that the anticipation rejections be withdrawn.

16
17 IV. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE PRIOR ART OF RECORD IN
18 THE CASE.

19 The Final Office Action rejected claims 5, 8, 12, 16, 21, and 23 under U.S.C. §103(a) as
20 being unpatentable over Webb, offering U.S. patent No. 6,210,275 to Olsen and U.S. patent No.
21 6,015,344 to Kelly et al. as evidence of certain matters asserted to be well-known facts. The
22 Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not obvious in view of Webb or in view of

1 Webb, and the Olsen and Kelly patents. In particular, the Applicants submit that claims 5, 8, 12,
2 16, 21, and 23 are allowable at least because they each depend on a respective allowable
3 independent claim.
4

5 V. FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE FINAL OFFICE ACTION

6 The Applicants note the following additional points regarding section 8 of the Final
7 Office Action.

8 The Final Office Action at page 7, lines 9-11 indicates that Webb discloses “that a player
9 must input a selection into a selection-type game before the outcome of the game can be
10 displayed.” This comment is made after referring to the concealment requirement in the
11 Applicants previous claims. The Applicants would like to note in this regard that claims 1 and 9
12 in the present case do not simply require concealing a result before it can be displayed to the
13 player. Element (d) of claim 1 requires concealing a “prize value” from the player during the
14 bonus round where the “prize value” is defined in element (a) as being associated with a game
15 play result (for a game) which is obtained independently of play in a bonus round for the game.
16 Claim 9 includes similar limitations in an apparatus context. Webb does not disclose or suggest
17 concealing a “prize value” as defined in claim 1.

1 VI. CONCLUSION

2 For all of the above reasons the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and
3 allowance of claims 1-18 and 20-23.

4 If any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or if a conference might
5 expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney
6 prior to issuing a further action in this case.

7 Respectfully submitted,

8
9 The Culbertson Group, P.C.

10
11
12
13 Dated: May 25, 2007

14 By: 

15 Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
16 1114 Lost Creek Boulevard, Suite 420
17 Austin, Texas 78746
18 (512) 327-8932
19 ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
20
21
22

1045_RCE_Response_070125FOA.wpd